

# THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

---

VOL. VIII.

JANUARY, 1928.

No. 1.

---

## Foreword.

Another year of grace has dawned. In preparing for another round of service, the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY is well aware that its course, including, as it does, unfaltering opposition to unionism and doctrinal indifference in general, will not be more popular in the future than it has been in the past. A generation which has produced the Lausanne Conference and is developing much enthusiasm in praising it will not be kindly disposed toward severe critics of this gathering. But evidently a religious journal must have higher ideals than those indicated by the word popularity. It is a truism that the public is best served when it is given, not what it likes, but what it needs. Can it be adequately told in a few words to what extent the Christian world to-day needs the admonition to extricate itself from the net of unionism? Those who have eyes to see cannot fail to notice that the appalling ignorance in religious matters which we observe in the youth of our land and which has often been commented upon by editors and educators, is largely due to these efforts at bringing into alliance various church-bodies whose doctrines are not in agreement, the result being a wide-spread disregard of doctrinal distinctions and differences and, finally, of Christian doctrine in general. The Romanists with more or less merriment dwell on what they call the collapse of Protestantism, finding their justification for this bold term in the inability of the average young Protestant to give an intelligent account of the religion which he professes to hold. It is to be feared that there is a result of all this doctrinal indifference born of unionism which is more lamentable and dreadful than anything hitherto alluded to — the substitution of trust in one's own good deeds for faith in Jesus Christ. Where doctrinal matters are relegated to the background, study of what is essential in the Scriptures easily ceases; and where this sad state of affairs obtains, Christ and His salvation are readily dropped from view. May God grant His grace to the readers and editors of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY that they, without becoming bigoted or fanatical, may remain firm in their opposition to all endeavors which tend to bring about a communion of light with darkness!

## The Lutherans at Lausanne.

(Continued.)

### The Church's Common Confession of Faith.

(Report of Section IV. Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*, August 19, 1927.)

"We members of the Conference on Faith and Order, coming from all parts of the world in the interest of Christian unity, have with deep gratitude to God found ourselves united in common prayer, in God, our heavenly Father, and His Son Jesus Christ, our Savior, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. Notwithstanding the differences in doctrine among us, we are united in the Christian faith which is contained in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to, and safeguarded in, the ecumenical creed called the Nicene and in the Apostles' Creed, which faith has been continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"We believe that the Holy Spirit, in leading the Church into all truth, may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems may from time to time demand.

"Finally, we desire to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ.

#### NOTES.

"1) It must be noted that the Orthodox Eastern Church can accept the Nicene Creed only in its uninterpolated form, without the *Filioque* clause; and that, although the Apostle's Creed has no place in the formularies of this Church, it is in accordance with its teaching.

"2. It must be noted also that some of the churches represented in this conference conjoin tradition with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular confessions, and some make no use of creeds.

"3. It is understood that the use of these creeds will be determined by the competent authority in each Church, and that the several churches will continue to make use of such special confessions as they possess."



Dr. Ainslie's comment is as follows: This report "brought to the front the creedal controversy. The majority of the communions represented hold to the Nicene and Apostles' Creed; others, such as Baptists, Congregationalists, and Disciples, recognize these as witnesses in past generations, but do not hold them in the same reverence, emphasizing instead a personal faith in the living God through the living Christ. The report sought, with much difficulty, to cover both of these positions." It surely was difficult, as the report shows. And Lutherans find it not only difficult, but also impossible to accept the report.

Some of these articles will be touched upon under the heading of "Unionism." The points to be touched upon here are the following. The Church to-day needs additional creeds besides the Nicene and the Apostles' Creed. (We note, in passing, that the Athanasian Creed was ignored at Lausanne.) A man may believe that Christ was "crucified, dead, and buried" and still not have the Christian faith. No Unitarian doubts that Christ was crucified. Protestants and Catholics are fully agreed on the death of Christ, but widely divided on the question of the effect of Christ's death. We need additional creeds. Dr. Sherer's interview: "Under no circumstances could the Church of to-day ignore what was won in centuries after that in which the councils of Nicaea and of Constantinople were held. Justification by faith, the universal priesthood of believers, phases of the doctrine of sin and grace, particularly as to the means of grace, were not defined prior to the sixteenth century. The statements of the Church upon these are as essential to the convictions of present-day believers as are those that concern the Trinity and the person and nature of Christ."

What does the statement mean: "It is understood that the use of these creeds shall be determined by the competent authority in each church"? It does not refer, of course, to the time and frequency of their use in worship. Does it mean that the Disciples are free to declare some or all of these doctrines open questions? Does it mean that the Methodist Church and others have the right to delete the "descended into hell"? And, by the way, does it mean that besides the authority of Scripture, and the authority of the congregation derived therefrom, there are other authorities that should act in this matter?

"We desire to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ." Substituting "without faith in the Gospel" for the modern formula:

"an inward and personal experience," etc., we agree with this solemn testimony. We doubt, however, whether the repudiation of the substitution of the creeds for faith on the part of the formalists is the sole intent of this paragraph. This paragraph was brought forth in hard travail. Originally it read: "Finally, inasmuch as in dealing with this subject of creeds we have been occupied in considering the place and importance of a common confession of the faith, we desire at the same time to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and written standards can take the place of that inward and personal experience of union with the living Christ, which is the only experience of spiritual vitality, and that the object of our faith is not any statement about Christ, but the Lord Jesus Christ Himself." The report as sent out by the Press Bureau of the World Conference contained this final statement: "and that the object of our faith is not any statement about Christ, but the Lord Jesus Christ Himself." (The report published by the Boston Secretariat, given in this article, omits that statement.) It cannot, of course, stand. Surely the object of our faith is the Lord Jesus Christ, but the statement puts into opposition what belongs together. Any man who refuses to believe the Biblical and confessional statements about Christ does not believe in Christ Himself. Christ is found only in the Word. "Outside of His Word and without His Word we know of no Christ, much less of Christ's thoughts. For that Christ who offers Christ's alleged thoughts without His Word is the odious devil out of hell, who assumes Christ's holy name and peddles under this name his infernal poison." (Luther, 17, 2015.) The animus of the men who appeal from the statements about Christ to Christ Himself is thus described by Bishop Candler: "The rationalists of the present generation, by their denunciation of all creeds, delude themselves into imagining that their opposition is to dogma rather than to Christ. But at the bottom their hostility is to Him. — Belittling the creed which enshrines Him, they betray the Savior, whom it glorifies." (*The Christ and the Creed*, p. 24.) Men of this stamp were responsible for the appearance of the pronouncement under discussion in the report in its original form. It brought out their position exactly. Frederick A. Wilmot, whose articles on the conference were widely approved in America, refers to this final statement approvingly and comments: "We imagine that even Dr. Harry E. Fosdick would not feel cramped with such an understanding of Confession of Faith; in fact, somehow across thousands of miles of ocean and in historically different



communions, Dr. Fosdick's new emphasis on our approach to unity seems to obtain." The questions now arise: Why was this final sentence deleted? And is what remains of the paragraph no longer a concession to anticonfessionalism? We can well imagine how "the creedal controversy" here raged and the "report sought, with much difficulty, to cover both" positions. Are both positions covered by the report in its final form? If the deletion of the original final sentence meant a repudiation of the view it expresses, the conference should have inserted in place of it a plain statement to that effect. Lacking this, the whole paragraph, we fear, is meant for a concession to the anticreedal party. It must now develop whether this party will repudiate or accept the report.

This section, as the report in its original form informs us, "has been occupied in considering the place and importance of a common confession of the faith." That was the time and the place for the Lutheran committeemen to propose the Book of Concord. The Lutheran Confessions propose themselves as such — the common confession of Christendom. The Apology declares: "Our confession is true, godly, and catholic"; and the Augsburg Confession: "This is about the sum of our doctrine, in which, as can be seen, there is nothing that varies from the Scriptures or from the Church Catholic." (*Trigl.*, p. 315, § 59.) A confessional Lutheran would not be true to his convictions if he refused to offer the Book of Concord as the true and comprehensive presentation of the Christian doctrine. Such an offer would, indeed, have produced another violent clash. But the object to be gained would fully compensate for the temporary hurt. The conference is striving after unity, and concerning that article which forms the heart of the Lutheran Confessions, the article of justification, Luther says: "If this single article remain pure, the whole Church will also remain pure, harmonious, and without factions." (5, 1170.) If Dr. Scherer had been a member of this section, he would have proposed it, we think; for in speaking of the confessional statements of his church, he chose to make use of this form: "the statements of the Church"; the Lutheran Confessions give voice to the mind of Christendom. And he would have had the approval of the *Lutheran*, which quotes approvingly the advice given to the Lutherans by Professor Rockwell of Union Seminary: "Why should not you Lutherans now take the initiative? . . . Here is a basis for discussion of a perfectly proper question: Why cannot Protestantism agree on its oldest creed, the Augsburg Confession? The discussion may not eventuate in church unity, any more than will

the great Life and Work or the impressive Faith and Order Conferences; but it will set the world talking about the Lutheran claims." — The insertion of such a proposal into the record would have provided splendid "material for future discussions."

### The Ministry of the Church.

(Report of Section V. Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*, August 20, 1927.)

"We members of the Conference on Faith and Order are happy to report that we find ourselves in substantial accord in the following five propositions: —

"1) The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church and is essential to the being and well-being of the Church.

"2) The ministry is perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit.

"3) The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the Sacraments, to be made effective by faith.

"4) The ministry is entrusted with the government and discipline of the Church, in whole or in part.

"5) Men gifted for the work of the ministry called by the Spirit and accepted by the Church are commissioned through an act of ordination by prayer and the laying on of hands to exercise the function of this ministry.

"Within the many Christian communions into which in the course of history Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of the several communions and their beliefs as to the mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These communions have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. But the differences which have arisen in regard to the authority and functions of the various forms of ministry have been, and are, the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings.

"These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of bishops, and the nature of apostolic succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recogni-



tion that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. We therefore add as an appendix to our report such a statement, commending it to the thoughtful consideration of the churches we represent.

“By these differences the difficulties of intercommunion have been accentuated to the distress and wounding of faithful souls, while in the mission-field, where the Church is fulfilling its primary object to preach the Gospel to every creature, the young churches find the lack of unity a very serious obstacle to the furtherance of the Gospel. Consequently the provisions of a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need.

“There has not been time in this conference to consider all the points of difference between us in the matter of the ministry with that care and patience which could alone lead to complete agreement. The same observation applies generally to proposals for the constitution of the United Church. Certain suggestions as to possible church organization have been made, which we transmit to the churches with the earnest hope that common study of these questions will be continued by the members of the various churches represented in this conference.

“In view 1) of the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the congregation of the faithful, respectively, had in the constitution of the early Church, and 2) the fact that episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom, and 3) the fact that episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church, — we therefore recognize that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church, and that each separate communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the united Church its own spiritual treasures.

“If the foregoing suggestions be accepted and acted upon, it is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the Church for the future should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory of the origin, character, or function of any office in the Church or to involve the acceptance

of any adverse judgment on the validity of ordination in those branches of the Church Universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic orders under other forms of ordination, or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacrament which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

"It is further recognized that inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon every believer and each believer has an immediate access to God through Jesus Christ, and since special gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as teaching, preaching, and spiritual counsel, are the treasures of the Church as well as of the individual, it is necessary and proper that the Church should make fuller use of such gifts for the development of its corporate spiritual life and for the extension of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

"In particular, we share in the conviction, repeatedly expressed in this conference, that, pending the solution of the questions of faith and order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals, but as churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples. We therefore commend to our churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service to more effective expression.

"In conclusion, we express our thankfulness to Almighty God for the great progress which has been made in recent years in the mutual approach of the churches to one another and our conviction that we must go forward with faith and courage, confident that with the blessing of God we shall be able to solve the problems that lie before us.

"Notes. — 1. The following is the view of the Orthodox Church as formulated for us by its representatives: —

"The Orthodox Church, regarding the ministry as instituted in the Church by Christ Himself, and as the body which by a special *charisma* is the organ through which the Church spreads its means of grace, such as the Sacraments, and believing that the ministry in its threefold form of bishops, presbyters, and deacons can be based only on the unbroken apostolic succession, regrets that it is unable to come, in regard to the ministry, into some measure of agreement with many of the churches represented at this conference; but prays God that He, through His Holy Spirit, will guide to union even in regard to this difficult point of disagreement."

"2. In Western Christendom also there are conspicuous differences.



“One representative view includes the following points: a) that there have always been various grades of the ministry, each with its own function; b) that ordination is a sacramental act of divine institution and therefore indispensable, conveying the special *charisma* for the particular ministry; c) that bishops who have received their office by succession from the apostles are the necessary ministers of ordination; d) that the apostolic succession, so understood, is necessary for the authority of the ministry, the visible unity of the Church, and the validity of the Sacraments.

“On the other hand, it is held by many churches represented in the conference, a) that essentially there is only one ministry, that of the Word and Sacraments; b) that the existing ministries in these churches are agreeable to the New Testament, are proved by their fruits, and have due authority in the Church, and the Sacraments ministered by them are valid; c) that no particular form of ministry is necessary to be received as a matter of faith; d) that the grace which fits men for the ministry is immediately given by God and is recognized, not conferred, in ordination.

“Further we record that there are views concerning the ministry which are intermediate between the types just mentioned. For instance, some who adhere to an episcopal system of church government do not consider that the apostolic succession as described above is a vital element of episcopacy, or they reject it altogether. Others do not regard as essential the historic episcopate. Those who adhere to presbyterial systems of church government believe that the apostolic ministry is transmissible and has been transmitted through presbyters orderly associated for the purpose. Those who adhere to the congregational system of government define their ministry as having been and being transmitted according to the precedent and example of the New Testament.”

Passing over, for the present, the unionistic pronouncements in this section, we find a number of other objectionable features. A few may here be pointed out. “The ministry is essential to the being and well-being of the Church.” The Lutheran doctrine is that the ministry is essential to the well-being, but not to the being, of the Church. Again: “We recognize that these several elements [the episcopal, presbyterial, and congregational systems] must all have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church.” A Lutheran does not use the word “must” in this connection. (It will, by the way, require very much further study to find the

conditions which will give an appropriate place to all three systems. It does not require any study to find a place for a *modified* episcopal system, but the real episcopal and presbyterial systems "as accepted by great communions" cannot be mixed with the congregational system.) Again: "— the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments to be made effective by faith." If that means that the efficacy of the means of grace is derived from faith, it voices the teaching, not of Scripture, but of enthusiasm.

Then, several important declarations are lacking. The Lutherans should have insisted on getting in a clear-cut statement to the effect that according to Scriptural and Lutheran principles the highest authority in the Church is vested in the congregation, such as is provided by the Smalcald Articles, p. 510: "Christ gives supreme and final jurisdiction to the Church when He says: 'Tell it unto the Church'; 'when two or three are gathered together in My name.'" Mere reference to the "congregational system" is not sufficient.

Finally, in view of the very great length of this section and the great importance attached by the conference to these matters it was indispensable that an eighth paragraph be added, declaring that the unity of the Church does not depend on "order," polity, forms of church government, and the like. The men back of the Lausanne movement are making too much of these matters. Its very name betrays it: "Conference on Faith and Order." The *Lutheran* is right in taking exception to this "cryptic caption" and in saying: "It is of little use that we try to place order in the same category as faith." The unity of the Church does not depend on unity of government. This Lutheran doctrine was brought to the attention of the conference. Dr. Elert's address did that. Also Dr. Scherer's: "The Church is free to determine its polity according to the circumstances and requirements of time and place." And he went on to repudiate the sacerdotal theory of the ministry, the necessity of episcopal ordination, the theory of apostolic succession, etc. Section V did not see fit to incorporate this doctrine in its report, and that, no doubt, was the reason why the *plenum* of the Lutheran delegation refused to vote on it definitively. But they should have gone a step farther and demanded that this or a later conference go on record in favor of Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, concerning which Professor Rockwell said: "Here is a great and, in the best sense of the word, *radical* statement: Church unity may be had *without* any so-called apostolic succession of bishops and without any historic episcopate." The report speaks



of "proposals for the constitution of the United Church" and says that "certain suggestions as to possible church organizations have been made." Why not make Article VII of the Augsburg Confession one of the articles of the proposed constitution? Unless that is done, the United Church will be united in name only. And it will be headed Romeward. The papacy developed, in part, from the misconception of the nature of the ministerial office, of "order," of "orders." The Roman Catholic theory, as set forth by an article in *America* discussing Lausanne, that "unity in government is an essential link of the unity of the Church of Christ," is only a few steps in advance of the faith-and-order theory. It is the business of the Lutheran Church to testify to these people on the supreme importance of the unity of faith, the relative unimportance of unanimity in questions of order.

### The Sacraments.

(Report of Section VI. Received by the full conference, *nem. con.*, August 20, 1927.)

"We are convinced that for the purpose in view in this conference we should not go into detail in considering Sacraments, by some called 'mysteries.' The purpose, therefore, of this statement is to show that there may be a common approach to, and an appreciation of, Sacraments on the part of those who may differ in conception and interpretation.

"We testify to the fact that the Christian world gives evidence of an increasing sense of the significance and value of Sacraments, and we would express our belief that this movement should be fostered and guided as a means of deepening the life and experience of the churches. In this connection we recognize that the Sacraments have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through faith.

"We agree that Sacraments are of divine appointment and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts.

"We hold that in the Sacraments there is an outward sign and an inward grace, and that the Sacraments are means of grace through which God works invisibly in us. We recognize also that in the gifts of His grace God is not limited by His own Sacraments.

"The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments and that for their valid administration there must be

a proper form, a proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments. Others again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit. In this conference we lay stress on the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper because they are the Sacraments which are generally acknowledged by the members of this conference.

"We believe that in baptism, administered with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit for the remission of sins, we are baptized by one Spirit into one body. By this statement it is not meant to ignore the difference in conception, interpretation, and mode which exists among us.

"We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, that we have fellowship with God, our Father, in Jesus Christ, His Son, or living Lord, who is our one Bread, given for the life of the world, sustaining the life of all His people, and that we are in fellowship with all others who are united to Him. We agree that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the Church's most sacred act of worship in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed, and that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an act of solemn self-oblation.

"There are among us divergent views, especially as to 1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord, 2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice, 3) the relation of the elements to the grace conveyed, and 4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language.

"We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed."

In view of the wide gulf separating the Lutheran and the Reformed conception of the Sacraments we cannot understand how a Lutheran could subscribe to a statement which proposes "to show that there may be a common approach to, and appreciation of, Sacraments on the part of those who may otherwise differ in conception and appreciation." This statement minimizes the differences and asserts that the Lutherans and the Reformed have much in common in this matter. (Section VI did not, it seems, in



establishing the common ground, aim at covering those churches which have seven sacraments and those which, "while attaching high value to the sacramental principle" [!!], have no Sacraments.) A Lutheran cannot admit that because Lutherans and Reformed both hold that the Sacraments are of divine appointment, Baptism must be administered with water, etc., and that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, they occupy common ground on the doctrine of the Sacraments. These two groups, of which one denies, and the other asserts, that the body and blood of the Lord are present under the bread and wine and that Baptism and the Lord's Supper convey the forgiveness of sins, have no common approach to, and no common appreciation of, the Sacraments. The prayer for the removal of the differences which prevent full communion at the present time must be accompanied by an honest recognition of the gravity of the differences and the insistence on the part of the Lutherans that the Reformed view of the nature and effect of the Sacraments be abandoned as unscriptural. It is not sufficient to state that there are divergent views. The situation calls for the statement that unless the unscriptural teachings be abandoned, there can be neither communion nor union.

Moreover, the Reformed members of Section VI succeeded in impressing their phraseology and views on the articles of agreement accepted by the Lutheran members. The Reformed view finds adequate expression in statements like these: "taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through faith," "who is our one Bread," "in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed." The statement, "We recognize also that in the gifts of His grace God is not limited by His own Sacraments," is perilously indefinite.

Finally the articles of agreement employ terms which cover up the divergence with ambiguous phrases: "Baptism administered . . . for the remission of sins." Have the Reformed agreed to the teaching that Baptism forgives sins? Certainly not, for the next sentence informs us that the difference in conception remains. So here we have a term which means something different to the Lutheran and to the Reformed. "We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present." The Lutherans believe that the body and blood of the Lord are really present. The Reformed believe that the body and blood of the Lord are really and absolutely absent. But both hold that the Lord is present! E.

*(To be concluded.)*

## Why Was Luther Detained at Worms after His Hearing Before the Diet?

W. H. T. DAU, Valparaiso, Ind.

### 6. That Critical Thursday.

While the scenes related in the last chapter were being enacted, Veuss was making report to the Estates regarding the conference with Luther during the forenoon. The communication of Peutingger, who claimed to have his information from Schurf, confirmed the Doctor Badensis in his opinion that Luther would finally submit to a verdict rendered on his case by the Estates. He gave the Estates a hopefully colored report, and on the strength of that report the Estates ordered that the conference with Luther be continued. Luther's safe-conduct was extended two more days,<sup>84)</sup> and the Archbishop of Treves sent word to Luther by Amsdorf that Veuss and Peutingger would meet Luther at his lodging the next day in the morning.

Thus the negotiations with Luther were taken up once more on Thursday, April 25, at six o'clock in the morning, at the hostel of the Knights of St. John.<sup>85)</sup> For this conference, Peutingger, whom Luther knew from his visit at Augsburg in 1518, was associated with the chancellor of Baden. Luther entered the conference accompanied by Schurf, Feilitsch, and Thun.<sup>86)</sup> Veuss and Peutingger demanded that Luther submit all controverted questions to the verdict of the Estates, without the reservation that the verdict must be in accordance with Scripture; for the latter, they said, was self-understood. The discussion on this point lasted three hours.<sup>87)</sup>

Luther himself acknowledged that he had never been drawn into a discussion that was conducted "in such a modest and kind-hearted fashion." His collocutors tried to make it plausible to him that he would yield no position that he had taken by declaring that all his treatises had been written for the edification of the Christian Church,<sup>88)</sup> and that, if the Estates should discover anything in these writings that did not serve the aforementioned purpose, he would retract it. Luther replied that he could not surrender the supreme authority of God's Word, nor could he accept as judges men who had condemned, burned, and rejected his writings before he had been given a hearing before the Diet. Veuss

84) RA, 607.

85) RA, 619.

86) EE, 64, 371 f.

87) Veuss, *Illgens Zeitschr.*, 21, 94. RA, 619.

88) Veuss, *l. c.*, p. 96.



spoke soothingly to him, assuring him that the members of the Diet, too, were Christians and could not harbor any other intention than to render a verdict in accordance with God's Word. Moreover, Veuss promised that he and Peutinger "would move that Luther's writings be committed only to unsuspected persons and all courtiers be excluded from this commission." Both Veuss and Peutinger spoke in laudatory terms about Luther's writings and said that by these writings the useless scholastic controversies had been pushed aside and genuine sparks of the evangelical doctrine had been brought to light. Particularly did they fully commend his opposition to the malpractises of the Roman See.<sup>89)</sup>

At last they had softened Luther to such a degree that he begged them to put themselves in his place and tell him honestly what they would do if they were in his place.<sup>90)</sup> Veuss declared that "in a like case he would commit his writings to his Imperial Majesty and the Estates." Luther declared that rather than accept the Emperor as arbitrator, he would forfeit his safe-conduct. Here Thun spoke up: "That is surely a sufficient and courageous offer!" He began to chide the two and would not listen to any further proceedings. But Doctor Philip (Feilitsch) remained.<sup>91)</sup> Veuss had received the impression that, after all, his proposal had not been altogether displeasing to Luther. In fact, Luther asked for time to consider it. It was nine o'clock; after dinner Luther promised to state his decision. In the mean time he wished to consult his friends. Peutinger and Veuss agreed to come in person to the hostel of the Knights of St. John to receive Luther's answer.<sup>92)</sup>

For Luther there had now come the most critical moments in the great week which he spent at Worms. We have no information whether he consulted Spalatin, or whether he knelt in silent prayer in his closet, or whether he conferred with his God in the garden of the Knights of St. John, which extended to the city wall. But more momentous hours than these German history has not recorded. The agony of striving to reach a decision weighed heavily upon

---

89) Veuss, *l. c.*, p. 95.

90) Luther to Albrecht of Mansfeld. EE, 53, 73.

91) EE, 64, 371 f.

92) In Veuss, p. 96, Veuss and Peutinger proceed to the archbishop, to whom they make report and from there back to Luther. Since Luther, in the mean time, was having a consultation with his friends, the second act in this conference, too, takes place in Luther's lodging, where Veuss finds the presence of the Saxon courtiers and of the servants annoying.

the monk. For the first time a way had been shown him that he could choose with honor to himself, while as to his own chosen path even a friend like Peutinger warned him that it would lead him straightway into the abyss. All around him Luther beheld venerable mementoes of Germany's past: in the city where at a former time Henry IV had in a fatal hour taken up his fight with Rome he was asked to decide the question whether his nation was again to pass under the old yoke of servitude which he had half taken from its shoulders already. Dagobert's dome looked down upon him; yonder the green waves of the sunlit Rhine were surging past him, singing their changeless melody which it had chanted to the Roman Caesars and the German Henrys. On the other side Krimhild's Garden of Roses spread its glories in the spring sun. All the spirits of the past crowded about him while he was holding counsel with himself. Were the Italians again to triumph? Must another witness against them abjure his faith as John of Wesalia had done in this very city of Worms? Or must he at least yield a little, as yonder in Suabia John Reuchlin had done? The mild and persuasive spirit of a friend like Peutinger and of an honorable gentleman like Veuss had confused Luther's mind. Moreover, he knew that also Elector Frederick and Brueck would be pleased to see him retract some things. But if he began to yield, where would his recession end? And on the other hand, if he did not retract everything, what would his recantation be worth? Could he put his trust in the Emperor and the Diet? "Put not your trust in princes nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help";<sup>93)</sup> "Cursed be the man that trusteth in man," —<sup>94)</sup> with these words of Scripture he had taken leave of Greiffenklau,<sup>95)</sup> and that was the answer which Peutinger and Veuss received when they called on Luther "after dinner, at one o'clock." Modestly, but firmly Luther explained to the two gentlemen that he could submit only to a decision rendered on the basis of clear texts of Scripture. Veuss was annoyed that this conversation, too, was not undisturbed. "Quite a number of persons from the knighthood and learned men came in." The Saxon noblemen became just as irritated against the two jurists as they had been against Cochlaeus the day before. Peutinger and Veuss were asked: "Being laymen and, moreover, married, how dared they presume to act in a matter that concerned

---

93) Ps. 146, 3.

94) Jer. 17, 5.

95) Cochl., *Comm.*, 40. Luther's own account in letter to Albrecht of Mansfeld. EE, 53, 74.



only doctors of Holy Writ?"<sup>96)</sup> But Luther took the side of the commissioners, who were, moreover, his guests. He said: "God's Word has a clear and simple meaning and can easily be read and understood by everybody. The tyrants at Constance were all doctors, and it was just they who erred." Interferences of this kind on the part of the Saxon knights created an impression among the other party to which Cochlaeus and Muenzer at a later date gave a literary and Greiffenklau, in a conversation with Luther, a personal expression, *viz.*, that Luther was under the domination of the Saxon courtiers and that his actions were prompted by fear of their vengeance. "If you had yielded at Worms, you would have been stabbed by the nobility," Muenzer wrote to Luther at a later time.

The mention of the Council of Constance suggested to Peutinger the thought whether a council would not, after all, be the correct way for composing this controversy. He said so, and his words took immediate effect. Luther himself declared that he was ready to acknowledge this tribunal, provided the holding of the council were not deferred very long and he were given a specified statement of the articles in which he was said to have erred. Peutinger accepted Luther's promise on the condition that Luther promise to observe obedient silence on the articles designated to him as heretical until the council would have rendered its decision. Luther agreed also to this condition, provided he were left free to lecture, write, and preach on all other points.

Meanwhile even the servants of the hostel had crowded into the room, and this caused Peutinger and Veuss to close the conference with the statement that they would communicate Luther's offer to the archbishop. Greiffenklau was highly elated over the message which his representatives brought him and wanted to hurry to the Emperor at once with the good news that Luther would submit to the decision of a council. However, he first sent for Luther, "desiring to speak with him personally; to terminate this business, if God would favor his effort."<sup>97)</sup> Accordingly, Luther once more appeared before the Archbishop of Treves at the hostel of the Teutonic Knights. Now, the misunderstanding that had entered the report of Peutinger and Veuss became apparent; for Luther, in the entire arrangement which he had entered into with these gentlemen, had meant, of course, that the council must render a decision in accordance with Scripture. Veuss complained bitterly

---

96) Veuss, *l. c.*, p. 97.

97) Veuss, *l. c.*, p. 98.

that the *Acta Lutheri* did not cease to assail Dr. Peutingen and himself for having made a false report to their master. He argued that the conference with Luther had taken place in the presence of a multitude of persons, all of whom would testify that Luther had not stipulated such a condition. This was undoubtedly true; but the reason why Luther did not stipulate the point in question was, because he regarded that as a self-evident *conditio sine qua non*. And every Christian so regards it. How could Luther have submitted the Word of God to a vote of any number of prelates? The thought is preposterous. When the error had become apparent, Greiffenklau endeavored with all his might to change Luther's opinion. For a long time he was closeted with Luther alone, and Aleander crosses himself with pious horror in recording the proposals which the archbishop made to "the monster," leaving him to choose whichever suited him best. Either he was to submit to a joint court of the Emperor and the Pope, or he was to submit his cause to the Emperor alone, or the Emperor and the Estates were to defer a decision on his teaching, or he was to withdraw his controverted teachings at once and submit the decision regarding the rest to a council.<sup>98)</sup> Inasmuch as the Pope alone can render the decision, Aleander regarded any of these proposals as more abominable than the other.

While Greiffenklau was conferring with Luther, Spalatin was announced. The archbishop had him, too, conducted "into the room up-stairs," where he was with Luther, and asked Spalatin to excuse him for having refused to see him the day before. The archbishop stated that Spalatin had not been recognized.<sup>99)</sup> And now the archbishop simply asked Luther to propose a way himself for establishing peace. Luther knew of no better way than that which Gamaliel had proposed, *viz.*, to let the matter alone and see whether it be of God.<sup>100)</sup> Let the Emperor write the Pope to this effect; for if his work were not of God, Luther himself expressed the conviction that it would come to naught within three, yea, even within two years. Greiffenklau now asked Luther how he would act if from his writings those articles were excerpted on which the coming council was to render an opinion. Luther replied: "My gracious lord, if only they will not be those articles which were condemned by the Council of Constance!" The archbishop replied that he feared the articles would be precisely the same. There-

---

98) Report of April 27. Balan, 74, p. 197 f.

99) Spalatin, *Annal.*, p. 44.

100) Acts 5, 38.



upon Luther said: "Most gracious sir, in that case I cannot yield, no matter what God wills that shall become of me."

Aleander claims that Greiffenklau himself communicated to him still other features of his conference with Luther. He reports that the archbishop had offered Luther a beautiful priory and a place at his table where he would not be hindered by his former benefactors to make his peace with Rome. With a similar offer of a beautiful abbey, Staupitz had been enticed to Salzburg, where he had been isolated and then forced to submit to the bull against Luther. Luther did not believe that the archbishop entertained any perfidious intentions when making him the offer. He was deeply moved by the archbishop's kindness and asked him to hear his confession in order that, under the seal of confession, he might lay open to him the condition of his conscience. It is strange indeed to be told that an archbishop heard the confession of a person who had been twice excommunicated; but even Christoph von Schwarzenberg reports a communication made to him the same day by Greiffenklau to this effect, "that Luther had privately and as a peculiar trust confided to him matters that must not be divulged or mentioned."<sup>101</sup>) Aleander tried very hard to learn the contents of Luther's confession. He reverted to his fixed notion that Luther had confessed to the archbishop who were the authors of his books. Of course, Aleander believed Erasmus to be the author. He represented to the archbishop what an illogical procedure it would be to keep a secret revealed in a confessional service, of a person who had attacked all the Sacraments of the Church and had destroyed confession. But the German prelate entertained more serious views of the Sacraments of his Church and refused the Romanist's request. Luther, too, is full of praise for the archbishop. In the letter to Albrecht of Mansfeld which he wrote on his return journey at Eisenach, he says: "His Princely Grace has made a good and more than gracious appearance in this matter; he would have been pleased to mend the affair."<sup>102</sup>) It is doubtful whether Greiffenklau fully deserved the confidence which Luther had placed in him. To Aleander the prelate excused himself for having shown kindness to Luther by saying that he would most certainly endanger his popularity were he to force Luther to recant the very least point. This statement agrees with the report of Veuss that as an experienced man of affairs the archbishop had endeavored to induce Luther to yield somewhat. Hence Greiffen-

---

101) RA, II, 874.

102) EE, 53, 74.

klau's mode of operation was similar to that of Cochlaeus, who boasted of the tears which he had wrung from Luther's soft heart. Nevertheless Luther in no way becomes lowered in our esteem for emerging as the dupe from his conferences with these priests.

At the close of his conference with the archbishop, Luther was completely exhausted and tired of all the useless wrangling in which he had to engage. He made use of the favorable opportunity urgently to request Greiffenklau to obtain his dismissal. He rehearsed the events of the last days: he had stood before the Diet and the Diet's Commission; he had had conferences with Eck and Cochlaeus and with Veuss and Peutingering; he had privately conferred with the *dechant* of Frankfort and the Archbishop of Treves. If matters that had been decided long ago were to remain decided, and he was asked to do nothing else than recant, what good would come from all these conferences? He was now tarrying at Worms ten days; he had exhausted his efforts to explain the reasons why he could not simply submit to the ruling of others; hence he asked to be permitted to depart. Greiffenklau saw the justice of Luther's request and said: "I will this moment ride to His Majesty and expedite this matter."<sup>103</sup> He met with no difficulty, for Chievres and Gattinara had themselves reached the conclusion that it was time "the dog be sent back and the judgment against him be duly executed."<sup>104</sup>

From the hostel of the Teutonic Knights, Luther, accompanied by Spalatin, walked to Hans von Minkovitz, who was still sick in bed with a malignant fever. With cordial words of solace he comforted the dying knight, who was preparing to join the great number of delegates to this Diet whom Worms detained forever, and at whose graves Luther is said to have remarked: "Blessed are those, for they are at rest!"<sup>105</sup> At the parting he grasped the knight's hand and said, "I shall leave to-morrow." Spalatin relates: "When he said that, I plucked his gown and said, 'Doctor, you are a good man'<sup>106</sup> for saying that you will leave to-morrow. Why, you have not been given your dismissal yet!' Then the good father said to me: 'You will see that I shall leave to-morrow.' And so he turned to his lodging. His companions, except Master

---

103) Spalatin, *Annal.*, 46.

104) BAL, p. 163.

105) *Beati, quia quiescunt*. Another version runs: "*Invideo, quia quiescunt*." I envy them, because they are at rest.

106) Meaning, a good-natured simpleton.



John Petzensteiner, had gone for a walk to look at Worms. Perhaps they, too, had a presentiment that their sojourn at Worms would not be long." They were not deceived in their anticipation; for the Emperor felt a powerful urging to remove the excommunicated friar from Worms.

The mild tone in which the last conferences had been conducted had been refreshing to Luther. He sums up the final result of these conferences by saying that he came out of them with considerable honor, while his adversaries wished that they might "have the beer back in the barrel where it was before." With great bitterness he remembers the proceedings in the conference with the commission of the Diet. He said that Duke George laughed every time he, Luther, appealed to the Scriptures, saying, "Have a care, my dear lords; in my own country I shall take good precautions." Luther complained that such wily tactics had been employed against him that Elector Frederick was forced to say, "I would not have believed that they would act thus." However, the Frankfort *dechant* Cochlaeus receives the worst mention in Spalatin's report: "Among all the adversaries no one showed himself more intolerant, jealous, and malicious than Doctor John Cochlaeus, or Schneck of Nuremberg, at present *dechant* at Our Ladies at Frankfort-on-the-Main. He had the boldness to suggest to Luther that he should surrender his safe-conduct in order that they might engage in a disputation."<sup>107</sup>) From the Wartburg Luther wrote to his congregation at Wittenberg: "I had hoped that bishops and doctors would try me [at Worms]; but their whole aim was to make me recant. God was gracious and brought it about that not all the princes and Estates consented to this scheme. Otherwise I should not have survived the shame I should have felt for the Germans for suffering the papal tyrants to fool and dupe them so grossly." But he also expressed surprise "because all his adversaries jointly were not bold enough to meet a poor beggar in conflict. . . . But they stay by themselves, among their partisans. There they frame resolutions; there they pass judgments; there they condemn without giving their opponent a hearing." Such were Luther's impressions of the grandees at Worms.<sup>108</sup>)

---

107) FU, p. 72. In addition: Myconius, p. 36, chap. IX: "*Das boes, zornig Gockelmaennlein Joannes Cochlaeus . . . erbot sich immer, mit Luther aufs Feuer zu disputieren,*" etc.

108) VIII, 211 f.

### 7. The Departure from Worms.

Even before Luther obtained his dismissal, the rumor had spread through the city that the monk was departing. The *Landhofmeister*, Christoph von Schwarzenberg, who had to make reports about Luther and his cause to Duke Louis of Bavaria, was prompted by this rumor to call on Luther towards evening of April 25. Schwarzenberg's account yields no further item of information regarding Luther. From Greiffenklau the nobleman received a faithful and exhaustive account about the archbishop's last conference with Luther. Luther merely affirmed to Schwarzenberg that he would leave Worms the next morning. In fact, on the same evening Eck, the official from Treves, together with the Austrian chancellor Schneitpeck and the notary Transilvanus, appeared at Luther's lodging to explain to him that, inasmuch as he had "stiff-neckedly" declined all admonitions to amend his ways and be at peace with the Church, His Imperial Majesty, as the guardian of the Church, would now proceed against him. He was to have a safe-conduct for twenty-one days to enable him to return to the place whence he had started. This safe-conduct would be kept for him, but he would not be permitted to excite the people on his journey by writing or preaching.

While these matters were being communicated to Luther, his companions returned from their sightseeing tour through Worms. Luther conducted the imperial messengers to the room downstairs<sup>109)</sup> and then, taking leave of them, said with great humility and meekness: "As it has pleased the Lord, so it has come to pass. Blessed be the name of the Lord!" He asked the messengers to convey his thanks to the Emperor and the Diet for having heard him, for having kept his safe-conduct, and for assuring him that it would be kept also for his return journey. He declared that he had never aimed at anything else than a reformation of the Church. For the rest he intended to surrender his body and life to the Emperor, reserving for himself only the right freely to confess the Word of God and bear testimony to it alone. With this significant closing remark he declined obedience to the prohibition to preach; for he was convinced that the Word of God must not be bound. Both parties shook hands and parted.<sup>110)</sup> Transilvanus is said to have been deeply stirred by Luther's farewell remarks. The monk had made such an impression on the notary that he loved to repeat with great warmth of feeling his parting conversation.<sup>111)</sup>

---

109) Spalatin, *Annal.*, 47. 110) RA, 611. 111) Spalatin, *Annal.*, 48.



The happy end, then, had arrived — Luther “was through.” But for the Elector and his counselors the last days had been days of considerable worry. The Elector was more low-spirited than he had ever been known to be; he was making up his mind that he must lose Luther. On the day when the conferences with the archbishop at Treves commenced, the Elector wrote to his brother: “I imagine they will chase him away and exile him, and if any one shows that he is well disposed toward Doctor Martin, he is counted a heretic. May God overrule everything for the best! He will not forsake the cause of righteousness, to be sure. I shall, God willing, keep your Love further informed regarding his dismissal.”<sup>112)</sup> Duke John, in a letter of April 4, had once more requested his brother to take care of the friar and to request the other princes in his name to do likewise.<sup>113)</sup> Now that the Elector had to come to a decision regarding Luther, he yielded to the persuasion of his counselors to provide for Luther’s safety. The Emperor had declared that as soon as Luther would have returned to his domicile, he would, as guardian of the faith, take measures against him. The indefatigable Aleander was already preparing measures that were to prohibit Luther’s possible escape from Wittenberg to Bohemia. If Luther arrived at Wittenberg, the Elector would be compelled to surrender him to the Emperor or openly to espouse Luther’s cause. For this reason the monk’s return to his starting-point must be prevented. He must disappear *en route* to Wittenberg, thus putting the Elector in a position to be able to say that he had nothing to do with Luther’s cause. Frederick assured the college of electors on a later occasion that he could take every kind of oath that he was ignorant of Luther’s whereabouts, and no one has a right to discredit the old gentleman’s statement. Most likely the Elector left Brueck and all other patrons of Luther free to act toward securing Luther’s safety, while he himself declined all share of their knowledge. Such a mode of action was fully in accord with the habitual practise of the Elector.

The foregoing is in accord with the presentation which Spalatin had made of the plan for rescuing Luther. He relates: “Now, the aforementioned, my most gracious lord, Duke Frederick of Saxony, Elector, was rather pusillanimous. He surely loved Luther, and he really felt great sorrow for him. He did not like to act contrary to God’s Word, nor did he wish to bring the

---

112) April 24; FNU, 15; RA, II, 871.

113) RA, II, 870; Spalatin, *Annal.*, p. 50.

Emperor down on himself. He was casting about for some means to remove Doctor Martin for a while, hoping that his controversies might be quieted, and on the evening before Luther departed [April 25], he indicated in the presence of Philip von Feilitzsch, Frederick von Thun, both knights, myself, and indeed not many others, that he desired to see Luther removed. To gratify Duke Frederick, Luther was obediently complaisant to this plan, although he surely was always much more ready to go forward courageously." <sup>114)</sup> The place where he was to be concealed was not yet revealed to Luther, neither to the knights who had been present when the Elector opened his mind.<sup>115)</sup>

With such an uncertain future before him, Luther lay down to rest for the last time at Worms. Once more in the early morning hours of Friday, April 26, the hostel of the Knights of St. John witnessed a concourse of people. "Luther's superiors and friends" all came, every one of them, to take leave of the friar. The Saxon account states: "In the morning of his departure there was a wonderfully great concourse of many excellent people, who came to say good-by to him." <sup>116)</sup> One of those present testified that Luther "departed in cheerful spirits and without fear" <sup>117)</sup> and was followed by the blessings of his beloved Germans. Only Aleander sent curses after him. He wrote to Rome: "So the venerable villain departed yesterday, before noon, with two wagons, after he had with his own hand, in the presence of many persons, toasted many slices of bread and drunk many a glass of malmsey, which he loves exceedingly." Of course, Aleander would have much preferred to see Luther himself roasted — a sight which would have made him enjoy his own malmsey all the more. The *Acta* only state that, after blessing his friends, the good father had breakfasted on a little bowl of gruel. But that was too tame an incident to report to Rome, where more spicy gossip was demanded. And the malmsey story seemed so plausible after the pious benefactress at Frankfort <sup>118)</sup> had furnished a basis for it. Poor lady! She had never dreamt of all the damage she would cause by her thoughtful and timely gift. From that day Aleander's dispatches, Cochlaeus's comments, and Muenzer's slanderous writings are filled with accounts of Luther's fondness for malmsey. A new epithet is coined

---

114) Cyprian, p. 50.

115) Spalatin, *l. c.*; De Wette, I, 588.

116) RA, 611.

117) Krel to Schweikart von Grundelfingen. RA, II, 885.

118) DTC, 182.



for Luther: "the Malmsian." If he had but drunk the thousandth part of all the wine these worthy reporters have made him drink, he could not possibly have stood without support at the Diet nor have attended those nerve-racking conferences after his hearing at the Diet, nor written any of the great books that came from his pen, nor engaged in the great work of building the Church, which engrossed his time and enlisted all his strength in the years after Worms.

The start for home was made at 10 o'clock. Since a cavalcade of twenty horsemen awaited Luther outside the Mainz Gate, Herald Storm considered it prudent to let Luther make the start alone. He followed him a few hours later. Aleander thinks that the horsemen had been sent by Sickingen; but it is more probable that they were the same friends of Luther who had met him at his entrance into Worms — Jonas and the Saxon noblemen. With this company Luther proceeded to Oppenheim, where Storm overtook him.

To cover up the ruse that had been devised to make Luther disappear, Spalatin had advised him to address a letter to the Emperor and the Electors <sup>119)</sup> after his departure from Worms. On the way from Worms, Luther began to write these letters. Myconius at least reports: <sup>120)</sup> "When he arrived at Weissenburg, which is situated in the Palatinate [Myconius means Weisenau, near Mayence], Luther wrote a statement of his doctrine and a brief confession and protestation, and sent it to the Diet."

## THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

**Luther's Small Catechism Retranslated.** — "The Intersynodical Committee on Catechism, at a recent meeting in Chicago, Ill., reached a final agreement on a uniform English text for the proposed new quadricentennial edition of Luther's Small Catechism. The seven general bodies officially represented in the committee are the Joint Synod of Ohio, Iowa, United Lutheran Church in America, Augustana Synod, the Lutheran Free Church, United Danish Church, and the Norwegian Lutheran Church. The work of the committee has already covered a period of two years. It has been decided to print one thousand copies of the new edition of the Catechism, to be submitted to the church-bodies for approval during 1928, and to be ready for wide-spread distribution early in 1929. — *National Lutheran Council Bulletin.*

119) EB, III, 143.

120) Cyprian's Ed., p. 41.

**Why Luther Failed as the Reformer** — according to the *Western Christian Advocate*. One reason, as just presented, was his failure to send out missionaries to foreign fields. "Another blunder in the history of our branch of the Church" (Protestant) "was that of not taking the lead in the social reform among the peasants of the sixteenth century. Luther's utterances were largely responsible for arousing the common people to hope for better things. Think of the effect of such words as the following upon people who were heavily oppressed by their rulers: 'Kings are made for the people; they ought to seek only the good of their subjects. . . . Oh, masters and lords, govern with moderation and justice! Your subjects will not long put up with your tyranny. . . . I am delighted to see the tyrants trembling.' Having aroused the people, Luther deserted them, and they were naturally guilty of those excesses which are always the result of unguided movements. Contrast with the above words the following statements: 'Peasants must hear the crack of the whip and the whizz of the bullet if they refuse to obey. Let the cannon balls whistle among them, or they will make things a thousand times worse. Dear lords, smite, stab, destroy; whoever dies fighting for authority is a martyr before God. . . . I pray every one to depart from the peasants as from the devil himself.'" Here are two queer things. It seems queer that Luther should be blamed for the refusal of the peasants to be guided by the advice of their best friend. And it is a queer thing that the writer in the *Advocate* should have so completely forgotten contemporary history. Does he not recall that the rumored machinations of the Reds called forth language on the part of the secular and religious press just as strong as that of Luther, that this language was employed while the Reds were not marching up and down the land, pillaging and murdering, as those peasants did, and that the users of such language were not reprimanded as he reprimands Luther?

E.

**The American Federation of Lutheran Brotherhoods**, the re-organized Lutheran Brotherhood of America, has, according to the *Lutheran*, for its major objective Lutheran unity. It seems to us, from the *Lutheran's* report of its present status, that it has just about reached its objective, that is, brought about a Lutheran union. It is reported to be no longer a sort of free-lance organization, but to be now definitely under synodical control. The new constitution, adopted October 12—14 at Milwaukee, was prepared by a committee consisting of representatives appointed by the presidents of the Augustana Synod, the United Lutheran Church, the Norwegian Lutheran Church, the Iowa Synod, the Suomi Synod, and the Lutheran Brotherhood of America, a member of the Joint Synod of Ohio being one of the Lutheran Brotherhood of America representatives. The new constitution had previously been officially approved by the Augustana Synod and the United Lutheran Church at their last conventions. The president of the Federation and the second vice-president are members of the U.L.C.; the first vice-president, of Iowa; the third vice-president and the treasurer, of the Norwegian Church; the secretary, of Augustana. The governing board con-

sists of the officers and three members of the U. L. C., two of Augustana and one of Ohio. The advisory members of the governing board are the presidents of the Augustana Synod and of the U. L. C. "The eagerness with which those present, ministers and laymen from most of the general Lutheran bodies in America, welcomed this opportunity for Christian fellowship and cooperation in great common tasks for the Church and the Kingdom was most encouraging and inspiring." If this report is correct, we do not see why the synods involved do not immediately form a federation. If their individual members are practising fellowship, why should the synods stand back? Whether the Federation, before proclaiming, practically, a union, established unity of faith among themselves, the report does not state. — The *Lutheran* adds to the statement quoted: "It again proves that the Lutheran manhood of America longs for the fulfilment of our Lords' prayer that all His disciples may be one, that the world may believe that God has sent Him." Unionists are wont to appeal to John 17, 21 as justifying their position. They contend that the conversion of the heathen, etc., is dependent on their seeing all Christians united in an external union. It was a favorite argument with the Lausanne unionists. Bishop Brent affirmed, according to the *Watchman-Examiner*, that through unity alone can the world believe and know that God has sent Jesus Christ to reveal Himself to the whole human race, and Archbishop Soederblom asserted that the spiritual unity by which all Christians are one is invisible and does not therefore manifest Christ to the world so that men may believe. It seems that the *Lutheran* is putting the same interpretation on the words of Jesus. But Jesus says nothing of the kind. He is speaking of the unity of faith, "that they also may be one in Us." It is the one faith that unites the children of God, not the external union. And this great united body exerts a mighty influence upon the unbelievers. If only a visible union could manifest Christ to the world so that men may believe, how can the wonderful achievements of the Gospel during all these centuries be accounted for, seeing that from the very beginning there were "heresies among you" (1 Cor. 11, 19)? Of a surety, the existence of heresies and disunion hampers the course of the Gospel, and every Christian will strive to remove the heresies which cause disunion by destroying the unity of faith. But Jesus does not countenance the movements which aim to establish union regardless of differences in faith and practise. If the Federation aimed at Lutheran unity, at the removal of doctrinal disagreements, we would be with it heart and soul. But as long as its objective is a mere external union, it is not standing on John 17, 21. Besides, it cannot consistently stop at a Lutheran union. It will have to go the whole way with Soederblom. E.

**Missionaries Widely Misrepresented.** — The *Watchman-Examiner* takes issue with an outrageous misrepresentation of the work of Christian missionaries which recently appeared in an Eastern daily. It writes: "One would suppose, after all these years, that the missionary efforts of the Church of Jesus Christ would not be caricatured and misrepresented. Certainly there are no men and



women in the Church of Christ more intelligent, more consecrated, and more self-denying than our missionaries. What a shame it is that a secular newspaper should publish such a false, such a flippant, and such an outrageous paragraph as we are about to quote! How difficult it is for us to do missionary work when right here at home we have newspapers that publish such scandalous things! The following paragraph appeared in an editorial of a leading afternoon newspaper of Baltimore, Md.:—

"The poor missionaries are doomed to offend their potential customers every time they open their mouths; for it is the essence of their art and mystery that they cannot wait for invitations to expound their Gospel according to their light, but they must roam around with a book in hand, banging every head in sight. The motive, of course, is impeccable. They believe that every Chinaman they may fail to fetch may sweat in hell through all eternity, and they yearn to save him, even against his will. The missionary, in Chinese eyes, is a bounder and a nuisance, and so he is doomed to go on bellowing in what may be called a hostile vacuum, save only when a dire belly-need induces those who dislike him to be polite to him. The advantage of being cured of gall-stones, or leprosy, or barber's itch to-day is more than sufficient compensation for the burden of having to be converted to Christianity in order to eat to-morrow. Man will never be wholly civilized until he ceases to intrude his snout into the shy, mysterious, and highly private recesses of his brother's soul."

Of course, such charges against mission-work do no harm. They defeat themselves by their own preposterous exaggerations and cause fair-minded people to think what noble motive lies behind such unselfish service and lofty altruism. Facts so grossly misstated require no refutation.

MUELLER.

#### Glimpses from the Editor's Window.

On October 10, 1927, the Leipzig Mission lost one of its prominent leaders through the death of Prof. Karl Paul, D. Th. The deceased had been at the head of the mission as its director for twelve years. Since 1923 he served as chairman of the *Missionskollegium*. In the upheaval and reconstruction period after the war he assisted the National Lutheran Council by serving as secretary of the Relief Committee for Germany.

The *Commonweal*, a Catholic weekly, states that Pope Pius XI will soon consecrate the first native Japanese bishop. He hopes that in 1928 the consecration of a Negro bishop may be announced. In keeping with the latter information is the effort being made at present to determine whether a Peruvian Dominican, Martin de Porres by name, who had a Spanish father and a Negro mother, may not be canonized and be declared a saint. The move seems to be popular, and hence it may be that evidence will be found which the respective authorities will consider sufficient.

Writing about efforts to win the Mohammedans for Christianity, Mr. Conrad Henken says in one of our exchanges: "One thing that has remained unaffected and apparently as virulent as it has ever been is the Moslem attitude toward the Christian. Regardless of surface amenities, the Turk instinctively despises the Christian. . . . Under the surface it is doubtful if Christian missions, in so far as the aim to win Moslems to Christ is concerned, have anywhere a more futile task. . . . The vitality

of Mohammedanism is shown in its spread into new fields and its growth in numbers to more than 200,000,000." Let us not forget these poor deluded people in our prayers!

Has there been any progress of late in mission-work in China? In 1926, as we all know, conditions were not favorable because the war-dogs were unleashed; and yet the Northern Baptists, as the *Watchman-Examiner* says, can report 20,349 baptisms for that year; and the paper adds that these figures cover only four-fifths of their stations. The paper quoted finds these figures very encouraging.

To what lengths modern evolutionists will go is shown by this statement of Dr. Fosdick, found in his recent book *Spiritual Values and Eternal Life*: "The cosmos did not stop with newts, but went on to Newton; it did not exhaust itself in crystals, but produced Christ." Dr. L. S. Keyser, who quotes these words, very correctly brands them as antichristian.

There is so much loose talk about faith in the camp of the Modernists that one does well to ponder these words of the *Presbyterian*: "Faith is a common possession of mankind. Men differ not as believers and non-believers, but merely as regards what they believe. And since so many people believe what is false, it is evident that there is much faith that ought not to be. Faith is not always a desirable thing. Whether or no it is desirable depends upon the thing believed."

We are accustomed to speak of the "yellow peril." Are we aware that for certain parts of the world there exists a "white peril"? As quoted in the N. L. C. B., Dr. Ludwig Weichert, Inspector of Missions for the Berlin Missionary Society, complains that "the unchecked immigration from Europe to Africa has not only affected native culture, but in many cases has annihilated it. The national and tribal unity of the natives is slowly, but surely dissolving in the face of European civilization. The Negroes of Africa are absorbing a socialistic doctrine and are rapidly gaining the socialistic viewpoint." Dr. Weichert says that no protection can be given except through the extension of the influence of the Gospel.

Dr. Adolph Harnack has much reason to lament that *tempora mutantur*. One of our exchanges says: "A year ago the Modernist thought he had a scholarly director in the German Harnack, but Dean Inge declared the other day in the *Modern Churchman* that "Harnack is as utterly obsolete as dear John Calvin himself." What an unkind cut from a fellow-Modernist!

According to the *Presbyterian*, a very damaging factor for the reputation of the recent Lausanne Conference is the endorsement given it by Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, president of the Federal Council of Churches. Quite true. When an out-and-out unionist like Cadman sponsors a certain movement, it is time to recall the old *senatusconsultum*, *Videant consules*, etc.

One of our exchanges thinks that the permission granted Dr. Cadman last summer to preach in the Anglican Church St. Martin's-in-the-Fields was an admirable exhibition of Christian charity. What a strange misapplication of a noble epithet we witness here! Is admitting a wolf into the sheepfold an act of charity or the greatest stupidity that can be imagined?

---

## BOOK REVIEW.

---

**Touring with God.** Devotions for Christian Pilgrims. Selected and arranged by *Theo. Graebner*. 192 pages, 4¼×6¼. \$1.75. (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.)

This book is something entirely new. The compiler, Professor Graebner, says in his introductory remarks: "The modern tourist has many a *vademecum* suitable for pocket, grip, or hand-bag, which supplies guidance and



direction both for motor tours and for trips by rail. The railroad folder and the hotel guide and, more recently, the Road Guide or Blue Book for motorists are deemed indispensable. Few of us fail to supply ourselves with these and similar aids for enjoyable, safe, and intelligent travel as we start on a tour. . . . But there has to my knowledge been little or no provision of an analogous kind for satisfying the needs of the spirit when we leave the home with its daily devotions and when we separate ourselves for a season from the sanctuary at which we are accustomed to worship on the Lord's Day. To many a Christian the motor trip, the railroad journey, the tour abroad, have meant a temporary severance of spiritual relations, which is apt, as the days of travel lengthen, to become almost complete. True, the Testament and Psalms have not been wanting in the equipment of those resolved to take God with them on a sightseeing or pleasure trip or on journeys for the restoration of the health, and if the present little manual is to be viewed as a substitute for that greatest of all companions and guides, God's Word, it were better it had never been written. But in supplying this help for those who desire to tour with God, I have given the major portion of it to extracts from that best of all books — selections from the Old and New Testaments, suitable for reading on various occasions during a tour, whether on land or sea, in good and evil days. A number of prayers and selected portions of sacred poetry have been added in order to give opportunity for utterance of those thoughts which the contemplation of nature, and the experiences of travel generally, stir up in the heart of a Christian." The book is neatly and durably bound and is put up in a cloth-board carton with a clasp. Thirty-two blank pages of strong paper are found in the rear of the book, on which may be added additional devotional matter or contemplations on the wonders of God found in nature or personal experiences which one has had on his tour.

FRITZ.

**Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Convention of the Iowa District of the Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, held at Charter Oak, Iowa, August 24—30, 1927.** 25 cts., postpaid; in lots of ten or more, 20 cts. a copy, postpaid. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., or from Rev. A. H. Semmann, Sec., 128 Vine St., Waterloo, Iowa.

Two excellent doctrinal papers are offered here, one German, the other English. Rev. F. Kreutz, Sr., furnished the German paper on *Die Heimat im Licht*," and Rev. N. P. Uhlig the English one on "The Christian's Home on Earth."

MUELLER.

**Fuel for the Fire.** Choice illustrations covering a wide range of Bible truths. By *C. B. Gohdes, Litt. D.* Compiled and edited by *J. H. Peters.* 341 pages; cloth; \$2.00. Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This is a most useful book, which, we are sure, pastors, speakers, and teachers in our midst will welcome. The title is somewhat misleading; it does not suggest the contents of the book. *Fuel for the Fire* consists of a large number of illustrations on subjects which occur again and again in sermons and devotional addresses, as also in the Christian instruction of the young. The book covers about three dozen subjects, such as Affliction,



Baptism, Conversion, Death, Faith, Love, Missions, Peace, Repentance, Resurrection, Sanctification, Sin, Sunday, etc. It contains striking illustrations for all festivals of the church-year and quotes a large number of men, usually learned and prominent, who have spoken favorably of the Christian religion. Not all illustrations have the same value; but we are certain that no pastor or speaker who purchases the book will be disappointed when looking for suitable material with which to illustrate the truths which he desires to inculcate. The name of Dr. Gohdes is well known in Lutheran circles; both as a writer and a speaker he ranks high among Lutheran divines. We heartily recommend this book to our fellow-workers in the Lord's vineyard.

MUELLER.

**Penn's Lutheran Forerunners and Friends.** By *Pastor John William Richards*. 342 pages. 75 cts. (The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus.) Order from Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

This volume is a companion story to the author's previous book, *How Lutherans Helped Win Liberty*. It bears the explanatory title, "Two Hundred and Fifty Years Ago," which has reference to the probable celebration, in 1931, of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania, recommended by Chief Justice Moschzisker. The writer tells the true story of the beginnings of the Lutheran Church in this country in narrative form, using several fictitious characters, whose lives he portrays. While it is somewhat difficult to narrate historic events in this way, the reader will find it easier to coordinate and remember the historic facts. The author has done his work very well and presents to his readers a most interesting story, each fact of which is based upon thorough historical research. To help the reader in impressing on his memory the various persons and events, he has prefixed a detailed statement of Lutheran dates and chronology, which, so far as the reviewer knows, is not found in any other book. The technical execution is excellent, and we are surprised that the Lutheran Book Concern can furnish this fine book at 75 cts. a copy, retail. It is just the thing to present to your boy or girl for a Christmas-gift.

MUELLER.

**Providence, Prayer, and Power.** Studies in the Philosophy, Psychology, and Dynamics of the Christian Religion. By *Wilbur Fisk Tillett*. Cloth; 338 pages; \$3.00. (Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn.)

Dr. W. F. Tillett, the author of this volume, is Dean Emeritus of the Theological Faculty and Professor of Christian Doctrine in Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. He is the author of quite a number of well-received books, and with respect to his doctrinal position he is a Fundamentalist. The volume before us is written in a reverent spirit and purposes to give the reader a comprehensive view of the Christian doctrine of prayer. The subject is certainly an important one, especially since Modernism has practically eliminated prayer. Nevertheless, we cannot endorse this work unreservedly. It offers so many details that the student easily overlooks the essential points. But this is not its serious fault. While the writer pretends to stand on Scriptural ground, he does not at all times offer true Scriptural doctrine. The very subtitle, "Studies in the Philosophy, Psychology, and Dynamics of the Christian Religion," in-

icates that the author, and not Scripture, is going to do most of the instructing. He weaves his "lessons" out of his own experience and that of other Christians and makes the Bible serve as a hat-rack for his speculations. As he does not recognize the Word of God as the means of grace, prayer itself becomes the most potent means of grace. Endeavoring to reconcile divine providence with human freedom, he advocates Arminianism (p. 65). Not satisfied with the simple Scriptural terms, he philosophizes theologically, and the result is often a jumble of words, which the reader does not understand. For instance: "Prayer is the expression of man's inmost need, *as a social being that is incomplete until he fulfils himself in another*" (p. 197). Quite frequently the author speaks as if he did not believe in the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost, *e. g.*, p. 316. Had the writer presented, in clear and simple terms, without "philosophy" and "psychology" and "dynamics," the Scriptural doctrine on "Providence, Prayer, and Power," what an excellent work this able and experienced teacher might have given to the Christian reader! As it is, the work is very unsatisfactory in spite of the many beautiful thoughts which it contains.

MUELLER.

The *Verlag des Schriftenvereins (E. Klaerner) Zwickau, Sachsen*, has sent us: 1. *Verhandlungen der 49. Jahresversammlung der Synode der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Sachsen u. a. St. 1927.* Price, 50 cts. Here authoritative information is given on the Synod of our brethren in Germany and the work they are doing. The essay submitted by *Dr. Nickel* treated of "The Church and Church-fellowship" and is printed in full. — 2. *Die Stellung der Ev.-Luth. Freikirche in Sachsen u. a. St. zu der kirchlichen Bewegung in Bochum-Hamme.* By *Dr. Geo. Mezger.* Price, 15 cts. In Hamme, a suburb of Bochum in Westphalia, a great number of people left the state church and sought affiliation with our brethren. The latter have been severely criticized for not refusing to have anything to do with the dissatisfied Lutherans at Hamme. *Dr. Mezger* ably and objectively tells what the controversy was about and shows how utterly groundless the charge of proselytizing is, raised against him and his coworkers. — Order through Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

**Christ-Child or Santa Claus?** A Christmas play for one male and five female characters. By *Amelia C. Krug.* 25 cts. (Antigo Publishing House, Antigo, Wis.)

**Christmas Cheer.** A Christmas play in two acts for four males and five females. By *Amelia C. Krug.* 30 cts. (Antigo Publishing House, Antigo, Wis.)

Both of these Christmas plays are intended to do away with the imaginary bewhiskered Santa Claus and to put Christ into the homes and the hearts of the people. The second one especially is very touching; it teaches a beautiful Christmas lesson of trust in the Savior, who is our only Helper in all the needs of both body and soul.

FRTZ.